

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed July 18, 2007.

Claims

Claims 1-19 were pending. Claims 2, 8-13, 15, and 19 have been amended. Claims 20-25 have been added. Claims 1-25 are currently pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 2. Claim 2 has been amended. While an embodiment of claim 2 may include estimating missing red pixels in green pixel locations, Applicant respectfully submits the Specification does support an embodiment of estimating missing red pixels in blue pixel locations. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the objection to claim 2.

35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 8-13 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 8-13.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8-12, and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kakarala, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,088,392) (hereinafter “Kakarala”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections.

Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that the standard for “anticipation” is one of fairly strict identity. To anticipate a claim of a patent, a single prior source must contain all the claimed essential elements. *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 231 U.S.P.Q.81, 91 (Fed.Cir. 1986); *In re Donahue*, 766 F.2d 531, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed.Cir. 1985).

Kakarala does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “calculating... interpolation errors...” or “selecting a direction indicated by a minimum of the EW error and the NS error as the edge direction (emphasis added)” as recited in claim 1. Kakarala does not teach calculating an interpolation error (e.g., Kakarala does not teach calculating an EW error or a NS error). Applicant respectfully submits the Examiner has not provided a location in Kakarala for the teaching of calculating interpolation errors. As noted above, the standard for “anticipation” is one of fairly strict identity. Applicant respectfully asserts claim 1 and claims dependent thereon are allowable for at least the above reasons. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 1 and claims dependent thereon.

Similarly, Kakarala does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “calculating... interpolation errors” or “selecting a direction indicated by a minimum of the EW error and the NS error as the edge direction” as recited in claim 8. Applicant respectfully asserts claim 8 and claims dependent thereon are allowable for at least the above reasons. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 8 and claims dependent thereon.

Furthermore, Kakarala does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “calculating... interpolation errors” or “selecting a direction indicated by a minimum of the EW error and the NS error as the edge direction” as recited in claim 14. Applicant respectfully asserts claim 14 and claims dependent thereon are allowable for at least the above reasons. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 14 and claims dependent thereon.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 6-7, 13, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakarala in view of Suga, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,832,143) (hereinafter “Suga”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections.

In order to reject a claim as obvious, the Examiner has the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Warner* et al., 379 F.2d 1011, 154 U.S.P.Q. 173, 177-178 (C.C.P.A. 1967). To establish a *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974), MPEP § 2143.03.

Neither Kakarala nor Suga disclose, teach, or suggest, either separately or in combination, at least “calculating errors in interpolation of the G-R channel in the EW, NE, NS, and NW directions at each pixel” as recited in claim 7. The Examiner has provided Kakarala for the teaching of this element, however, as noted above, Kakarala does not teach calculating interpolation errors and, furthermore, the Examiner does not provide a location in Kakarala for this teaching. Applicant respectfully asserts claim 7 and claims dependent thereon are allowable for at least the above reasons. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 7 and claims dependent thereon.

Applicant respectfully submits claims 6, 13, and 19, dependent on patentably distinct claims 1, 8, and 14, respectively, are allowable for at least the above reasons. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claims 6, 13, and 19.

New Claims

Applicant respectfully asserts the cited art does not disclose, teach, or suggest, either separately or in combination, the elements recited in new claims 20-25.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5896-08600/JCH.

Also filed herewith are the following items:

- Request for Continued Examination
- Terminal Disclaimer
- Power of Attorney By Assignee and Revocation of Previous Powers
- Notice of Change of Address
- Other:

Respectfully submitted,

/Russell Henrichs/

Russell Henrichs, Reg. #50354
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: October 18, 2007 JCH/REH